

JPRS: 5012

22 July 1960

19991222 045

THE IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF REVISIONISM IN QUESTIONS
OF CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

- USSR -

by I. Lemkin

RETURN TO AGENT FILE

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 2

Photocopies of this report may be purchased from

PHOTODUPLICATION SERVICE
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE
205 EAST 42nd STREET, SUITE 300
NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

JPRS: 5012

CSO: 4004-N

THE IDEOLOGICAL ROOTS OF REVISIONISM IN QUESTIONS
OF CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

/Following is a translation of an article written by
I. Lenin, [source not indicated] pages 81-97.]

V.I. Lenin described revisionism as a product of bourgeois thinking, and revisionists as prisoners of an alien class, who bring up the rear of bourgeois ideology and politics and the labor and socialist movement.

The ideological sources of modern revisionism in regard to problems of international relations also flow from bourgeois and right-wing reformist policy and ideology. All the basic premises of revisionism in this area -- the thesis of the two equally strong military blocs and the concept of a "third power", the ignoring of the true causes of international tensions and the defense of American imperialism, the general underestimation of the danger of war, confusion in regard to peaceful coexistence and the possibility of preventing war, the falsification of the history of postwar diplomacy and the slandering of USSR foreign policy -- all this, to a greater or lesser extent, is a reflection of the related ideological and political pronouncements of the politicians of monopolistic capital and its right-wing reformist servitors.

In the YCL [Yugoslav Communist League] program, the question of the two world systems, the two camps, the socialist and capitalist, and the basic contradiction of modern social development which is the contradiction between these systems, is replaced by the "concept" of two, essentially similar military blocs, opposing each other on the world arena and thereby creating an atmosphere of international tension.

This "concept" has nothing in common with historical facts. The rise of the world system of socialism and the system of socialist states, the splitting of the world into two camps -- capitalist and socialist -- the collapse of the world capitalist economy and the formation of a world socialist market (economy) in addition to the world capitalist

market (economy) -- these are entirely legitimate progressive phenomena, based on the essence of the modern epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. In the final text of the program approved by the 7th YCL Congress, it is correctly indicated that the contradiction between the capitalist and socialist systems is the principal contradiction of modern times. However, the question is differently stated in the program draft. Here, this contradiction is described as merely "one of the decisive ones." In the speeches of YCL leaders at the 7th Congress, regret was expressed that "economic integration" on a world scale was lacking. This revealed a misunderstanding of the entire essence of modern international life and disregard of the progressive, historical importance of the rise of the world system of socialism, of the world socialist economy.

Two systems, two camps, are not in the least equivalent to two military-political blocs. The first is the result of a legitimate world development, the second has been engendered by political reactionary imperialist forces which are trying to turn back the wheel of history, to "correct" the historical results of the Second World War. In its relations with the capitalist system, the socialist system stems from the principle of peaceful coexistence, it has no need of military power and military blocs for its economic and political development and for its final triumph. Aggressive military blocs have been set up by the imperialist camp, whereas the socialist countries were compelled to set up the Warsaw Pact merely to defend themselves from the danger of war that menaces them. At the same time, the socialist camp consistently demands the liquidation of all military alliances and their replacement by a universal system of collective security.

The revisionist concept of the "two blocs" gives an entirely distorted picture of the modern international situation and the distribution of class forces on the world arena. This concept, moreover, has been borrowed from bourgeois political and historical science.

Capitalist politicians and scientists -- historians and economists -- have always asserted that military blocs were knocked together as a defense against the alleged Communist threat, the non-existent "danger of aggression" by the USSR. Back in 1919, V. I. Lenin wrote:

There are stupid people who shout about red militarism; they are political crooks who pretend that they believe in ... this nonsense... (V.I. Lenin. Works, Vol. 29, p. 48).

Political fools and especially crooks, are rife in our own times. However, it is more and more difficult for these crooks to speak of the "Soviet threat", of the would-be aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, to justify their own aggressive imperialist policy. In seeking more effective means of deceit and disguise, they have resorted to the concept of "two blocs," "two super-powers."

Arthur Toynbee, the acknowledged head of modern bourgeois historical science, in a preface to the political annual review for 1949-1950 that came out in 1953 describes the distribution of forces on the international arena after the Second World War as follows:

"Two super-powers emerged from the Second World War -- the US and the USSR. The development of technology has reduced distance and narrowed the world to the size of a narrow court on which the Soviet-American duel is now being fought; the two giants are crowded on one planet, each of them is trying to extend its "sphere of influence" to draw as many countries as possible into its orbit.

The result of identical Russian and American states of mind is the striving of each of these powers in competition with its rival to bring as large a part as possible of the rest of the world into its own camp." ("Survey of International Affairs, 1949-1950". Royal Institute of International Affairs. L., 1953, p. 1)

What is the official role of this political concept?

First, false "objectivity" and "impartiality" are used to equate the USSR and the US and to ascribe to the Soviet Union the same aggressiveness, the same expansionism that is typical of the US, though in actual fact, the nature of Soviet policy is the exact reverse of the nature of American policy.

Secondly, representing modern world policy as rivalry between two "super-powers", two similar blocs, is used to disguise and conceal the true class socialist meaning of the struggle, to conceal the fact that this struggle is occurring not between two rival powers, and the blocs headed by them, but between two socio-political systems, two opposite trends in international relations -- the camp of socialism, peace progress, and the freedom of nations, and the camp of imperialism, aggression, reaction and colonialism.

Finally, the theory of "two super-powers," two blocs, denies the role and importance, the sovereignty and independence of all other countries, great and small, and reduces all the countries of Western Europe (this stems from the postulates of Toynbee on the age-old struggle between the West and the East) to the position of satellites in the American blocs.

The theory of "two super-powers" was gladly seized upon by the English rightist laborites, and also the right-wing socialists of other West-European countries. But here, they were confronted by a difficult problem: it is easy to explain the expansionism and aggressiveness of American monopolistic capital, which is knocking together military blocs, but what motives can be ascribed to the Soviet Union since invasive, aggressive intentions are plainly incompatible with its peaceful foreign policy?

Toynbee himself, to get out of this awkward situation, has dragged out the argument of "fear". In the preface to the 1947-48 issue of the Annual Review he declared that the Soviet people is beset by "fears of encirclement" which have given rise to international tension ("Survey of International Affairs. 1947-1948." L., 1952.) In his preface to the next issue, in speaking of the world conflict that arose during the postwar period, Toynbee again replied: "The cause of this conflict was not greed but fear." ("Survey of International Affairs. 1949-1950." L., 1953).

Thus, Toynbee was compelled to admit that the Soviet Union was not "greedy," i.e., that it lacked expansionist aims, but ascribed to it a would-be "fear complex." Right-wing laborite foreign-policy experts followed suit. In a brochure entitled: "Cards on the Table," issued by a group of laborite journalists in Martate in 1947 they proclaimed that "universal fear has been the main factor in world policy since 1945." ("Cards on the Table." L., 1947). They did not dare charge the Soviet Union with any aggressive intentions: Russian policy is not necessarily determined by economic or imperialist motives." The notorious "fear," in their opinion, is great enough to touch off a new world war. Finally, the Fabian essays on foreign policy, published in 1957, again speak of "fear" but in a somewhat altered form, as an "external threat," without which, presumably, "dictatorial regimes" cannot get along. (Fabian International Essays." L., 1957, p. 21).

The thesis of fear is a testimonial of reactionary bourgeois and right-wing labor politicians to their own property. They replace a serious economic and political analysis of international relations with the empty and inane game of "psycho-analysis", countering Marxist science with the quackery of "social freudianism."

The absence of a scientific, class, economic and political analysis of international relations is typical of rightist socialist writings which usually echo bourgeois political pseudo-science. In particular, of a socialist foreign policy, asserting that the foreign policy of a country, irrespective of whether this country is capitalist or socialist,

is always based on force, on a search for "spheres of influence," on geographical, geopolitical, psychological and similar factors. In the "New Fabian Essays," published in 1953, it is asserted that the "Leviathan" of Hobbs, which bases policy on strength, is a "better foreign policy guide than the Fabian Essays." ("New Fabian Essays." L., 1953, p. 161).

It is not hard to see that the revisionist concept of the "two blocs" has been lifted from the writings of the arch-bourgeois historian Arthur Toynbee and his right-wing socialist followers and that it has the same official role. Whether or not, the preachers of the thesis of the "two blocs" welcome assertions of the "principle of strength" the subjective concept of "hegemony," by which presumably "all" the countries at one time or another have been guided, they nevertheless take it upon themselves to repudiate scientific Marxist-Leninist analysis of the international situation by disguising the basic meaning and contradictions of modern times, by equating two opposite trends of world development, and by concealing the true sources of international tension and the threat of war.

The history of postwar international development and the rise of blocs, as it was expounded at the 7th YCL Congress, seems copied from bourgeois sources. Among other things, it mentions the "method of dividing the spheres of influence," which presumably began back at the allied conference of the war period. It is universally known, however, that neither in Teheran, Yalta nor Potsdam, did the Soviet Union try, in contradistinction to the capitalist powers, to obtain any "spheres of influence," but that it steadfastly and resolutely defended the right of the peoples of Central and South-Eastern Europe, including Yugoslavia, to national independence. This was one of the conditions that made it possible for many of these countries, including Yugoslavia, to take the path of independent development.

Perhaps the Yugoslav politicians had in mind the war-memoirs of Churchill. They contain a reference to his message to I.V. Stalin dated June 23, 1943 (an answer to I.V. Stalin's letter of 21 June), in which it is proposed or even declared as an established principle that "Yugoslav affairs should be decided on a base of 50 percent Russian and 50 percent English influence." But this message, had it existed, could express only the ideas of Churchill. Actually, there has been no such message. At any rate, the Soviet archives reveal no such message, but they do reveal an entirely different answer by Churchill to Stalin's letter of 21 June in which there is no mention of any 50 percent." This reply has been included in the correspondence of heads of governments during the war, published in the Soviet Union. (The

correspondence of the Chairman of the Council of Ministers USSR with the President of the US and the Prime-Minister of Great Britain during the Great Fatherland War 1941-1945." Vol. 1, 1957, p. 377).

A still more striking example of borrowing from falsified bourgeois sources is the description of the organization of NATO. In the speeches given at the 7th YCL Congress it was pointed out that the unyielding "Stalinist policy" was allegedly "the basic cause of the setting up of the Atlantic Pact." This is how the organization of NATO is usually described in reactionary bourgeois historical works. Only the American atom bomb and the organization of NATO, so claim bourgeois politicians and scientists, have averted the "inevitable invasion" of Europe by the Soviet Union. But there is the testimony of a bourgeois figure who can speak with more authority on this matter, George Kennan. At the time NATO was being organized he occupied a high post in the US Department of State. In 1948 he headed the Committee for the working out of the conditions of the North Atlantic Alliance. This is what Kennan writes in his recently published book: "I have never believed that the Soviet government has wanted a world war at any time since 1945, or that for any rational political reason it was inclined to start such a war, even if atomic weapons had not been invented. In other words, I do not think that the fact that we had atomic weapons is what prevented a Russian invasion of Europe in 1948 or at any time." George Kennan. Russia, the Atom and the West. L., 1958, p. 53]. We see that even the level-headed bourgeois figure exposes the historical falsification with which the leading YCL figures have apparently identified themselves.

At this juncture, history is in tune with modern times. The Marxists have always based their reasoning on the existence of an indestructible relation between politics and economics ("Politics is concentrated economics"), between domestic and foreign policy. Hence it is clear that the two camps, the two systems -- the socialist and capitalist -- by virtue of their differing economic, social and class essence, cannot step forward with identical principles, ideals and methods on the international arena. On the contrary, they must be and indeed are, the bearers of directly opposite trends in international policy. Truly scientific, Marxist-Leninist analysis of the modern world situation and foreign policy of two opposite camps, two systems, is given in the Declaration and Manifesto of Peace of the Conference of representatives of the Communist and worker's parties which occurred in November 1957. The Peace Manifesto gives an exhaustive substantiation of the policy of peace conducted by

the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries: not one Communist party, not one socialist country has any reasons for invading foreign lands, for attacking foreign countries; the socialist countries have no classes or social strata interested in war: the aim of Communism is the building of a society ensuring universal welfare, the prosperity of all the peoples and eternal peace among nations: socialist countries need a solid peace for the construction of such a society: they do not wish to foist their ideology, their social and political system on anyone, they strictly adhere to the principle of the peaceful coexistence of two systems, noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries, and the policy of peace and international cooperation. The world socialist system is a powerful stronghold of peace.

At the same time, the Peace Manifesto, directly and frankly, names the sources of war danger threatening the cause of peace and security of nations: the presence of capitalist monopolies that have battened on two world wars and are dreaming of a new world war; the armaments' race on which the same monopolies are battenning; the policy of monopolists, essentially the American, which rejects disarmament and nuclear ban proposals, as well as all other measures designed to prevent a new war, to liquidate the "cold war" and to establish trust among nations.

This exhaustively clear Marxist-Leninist analysis of the distribution of world forces, of sources of international tension and military danger, is radically at variance with the analysis given in the YCL program at the 7th Congress, despite the fact what signatures of the YCL delegation stand under the Manifesto of Peace.

The rejection of the class, party and scientific analysis of modern international relations inevitably brings revisionist elements to the pacifist-Manilov-like evaluation of the general world situation, to forgetting the war danger and the existing threats to the cause of peace.

What is the concrete expression of the ignoring of war danger by modern revisionists?

Firstly, as was already pointed out above, this is reflected in the minimizing of the basic contradiction of modern times -- between the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism and the external dangers flowing from this.

Secondly, the ignoring of war danger is connected with disregarding the role of intra-imperialist contradictions. The exaggeration of the role of state-monopolist capitalism on the national and international scale, and the uncritical attitude toward the present-day activity of the United Nations, along with a total absence of an analysis of the problem of unequal development of modern capitalism and the deepened capitalist contradictions that stem from this, create an idyllic

picture of the imperialist camp that does not in the least conform to the facts.

In this respect, the revisionists are far from being original. The rightist reformist concepts of modern capitalism also rest on the denial of radical contradictions inherent in it, including the worsening contradictions between imperialist powers for markets, the sources of raw materials, the spheres of influence, and world domination. The "International Fabian Essays" 1957, are typical in this respect (since British right-wing laborites today are the ideological headquarters of international reformism and revisionism). The authors of a considerable part of these essays are trying to prove that modern capitalism has got rid or is getting rid of its basic contradictions: by using the economic recipes of Keynes it has freed itself from cyclical development and crises; as a result of the emancipation of the former colonies the contradictions between the parent state and the colonies are being liquidated; finally, the contradictions between capitalist powers who work under the leadership and aegis of the US have receded far into the background, for "not one other Western power can hope seriously to compete with the unquestionable economic supremacy of the US." (Fabian International Essays, p. 19).

The right-wing socialists who believe that what they desire is actually true and who deny the existence of intra-imperialist contradictions carry out the social order of Wall Street and City bosses. All the speeches, pamphlets and political writings of representatives, agents and defenders of monopolistic capital are full of hysterical appeals for unity in the capitalist camp as their anchor of salvation.

The authors of the YCL program are plainly under the influence of right-wing socialist reformists. It is typical that this became evident at a time when contradictions between capitalist powers have become more acute against the background of a world economic crisis, and the more aggressive imperialist circles under the slogan "either a crisis or a war" are seeking a way out of the economic difficulties standing in the path of foreign adventures.

Thirdly, the ignoring of the danger of war is related to the direct or oblique defense of American imperialism which is the main center of world reaction and aggression.

The justification of American imperialism is inherent in the very concept of "two equal blocs," insofar as it veils the fact that the aggressive imperialist bloc has been knocked together by the American monopolies and is their tool in the struggle for world domination.

The speeches delivered at the 7th YCL Congress extoled the "Marshall Plan" and American "aid" to Yugoslavia, though it is known that this "aid" is designed to enslave and subordinate the countries receiving it and that the American rulers themselves make almost no secret of the fact that this "aid" is one of the principal tools of their foreign policy and the component part of their military policy and strategy. (In Eisenhower's message to Congress on the "aid" program it was pointed out that were it not for this "aid", the United States would have to increase its own war appropriations and expand the size of its military forces ("The New York Herald Tribune," 1958, February 20). In particular, the "Marshall Plan" was part and parcel of the aim of forcing Communists out of the governments of France, Italy and other West-European countries.

Revisionists and rightist reformists of various countries are busily defending American imperialism; they are also doing this in the United States proper. The resolution of the National Committee of the Communist Party to expel revisionist John Gates says: "He denies the fact that American imperialism is at present a source of military danger." ("Political Affairs," 1958, March, p. 7). Gates articles (like the YCL program) do not contain even a mention of US imperialism and its aggressive policy. A complete description of American imperialism is found in the Declaration of Communist and workers' parties of socialist countries: Aggressive imperialist circles in the US are implementing a so-called policy from positions of strength, they try to achieve domination over most of the world's countries and to prevent the forward movement of mankind in conformity with the laws of the development of society. Under the screen of "struggle against Communism" they strive to subordinate an ever-increasing number of countries, push for the destruction of democratic freedoms, threaten the national independence of developed capitalist countries, wish to put the colonial yoke in a new form on newly liberated peoples and conduct a systematic hostile subsersive activity against socialist countries. By their policy, certain aggressive circles in the United States endeavor to concentrate around themselves all the reactionary forces of the capitalist world. By doing this, these circles are becoming the center of world reaction and the worst enemies of the masses. These anti-people aggressive imperialist forces are preparing their own destruction by their policy, they are digging their own graves." ("Pravda," 22 November 1957).

Daily and hourly, life confirms the correctness of this characterization. The reactionary monopolistic circles in the

United States continue to repudiate the principle of coexistence, basing their policy on the premise that war is inevitable. Recently, they have been forcefully putting forth the bugbear of an alleged "economic threat" by the socialist system, thereby giving new food to the adventurist ideas of "preventive war." Despite the collapse of their diversionary Hungarian demarche, they adhere to the notorious "doctrine of liberation," i.e., the program of the restoration of capitalism in socialist countries.

In repudiating the peace proposals of the Soviet Union, they keep up the insane armaments race and to calm and deceive public opinion they spread the myth of the possibility of "limited," "local" atomic and thermonuclear war. They are not averse to transferring the policy of force and pretensions to world domination to outer space. This is what we read in the report of the Committee of Johnson (Senate Democratic leader and chairman of the War Preparedness Subcommittee) submitted to the US Senate at the beginning of 1958: "The scientists testify as follows: control over outer space means control over the world, more effective and all-embracing than any control that can be attained with the aid of arms, the army or military occupation. From outer space, the masters of infinity would be able to control the weather on earth, to bring on droughts and floods, change the tides, raise the sea level, deflect sea currents, change a warm into a cold climate. The importance of this is obvious. For many years to come we shall be busy with armaments." ("The New York Times,") 1958, January 8). To be sure, even among the monopolistic circles of the US not everybody is infected with such wild ideas of world domination. The actual situation, marked by the failures and defeats of American foreign policy, has had a sobering effect on many persons. The trend against the suicidal "atomic diplomacy" and for the recognition of principles of coexistence and cooperation is becoming stronger. But in the meantime, the tone in the ruling circles of the United States is set by the advocates of the "policy of strength", atomic strategy and "cold war."

Finally, the ignoring of the danger of war is coupled with theoretical confusion in questions related to the avoidance of war in modern times and the principle of coexistence.

The new Marxist-Leninist statement on the possibility of avoiding war in modern times is based on the scientific analysis of the relation of forces on the world arena. The process of the collapse of imperialism and the strengthening of the world socialist system has been accelerated. Today, the Soviet Union which was once in the midst of capitalist encirclement, is not alone in defending the cause of peace,

as was the case on the eve of World War II. Many countries of Europe and Asia are united within the powerful socialist camp. The concept of "capitalist encirclement" has become a thing of the past. The cause of peace today is defended by the whole unconquerable camp of socialist countries headed by the Soviet Union, by peace loving peoples of Asia and Africa, the international working class, the people of the imperialist countries. These mighty modern forces by uniting can avoid war. The actual possibility of averting a world war was proved during the attack of imperialistic colonizers on Egypt in the fall of 1956, and also when they led an armed attack on Lebanon and Jordan, as they prepared for broader operations against the peoples of the Arab countries. War is no longer fatally inevitable. But this does not mean that the danger of war has been entirely eliminated. The possibility of avoiding war is not always an actuality.

The revisionists, as in America, try to interpret the possibility of preventing war in an opportunistic-pacifist spirit: the danger of war, allegedly has been eliminated, the world has now entered the state of peaceful coexistence, the cause of a lasting and solid peace has been assured. Revisionist Gates wrote in November 1956: "The forces of war have not proved to be sufficiently powerful and have suffered defeat. The cold war is slowly but surely waning and we have entered a new era of peaceful coexistence which, apparently, will long continue..." ("Political Affairs," 1956, November, p. 48). In Gates' opinion, the world policy has shifted in favor of economic competition. This was written at the time when international imperialism was undertaking two simultaneous armed diversionary actions -- one in Hungary for the purpose of splitting and weakening the socialist camp, the other in Egypt, to restore colonialism in that area and to weaken the front of the peoples of Asia and Africa.

The American revisionists concept of the alleged advent of the "new era" of peaceful coexistence is indivisibly related to other opportunistic theses of the allegedly altered nature of American imperialism. Bittelman, who bases his views on the problems of policy and strategy of the Communist Party of the US, in his notorious "theory of exclusiveness" of American imperialism also asserted that the battle for peace has been won. In his article printed in "Political Affairs" he related the peaceful prospects sketched by him, to the "welfare state". He actually proposed replacing struggle for socialism with this slogan borrowed from bourgeois propaganda. ("Political Affairs," 1958, February, p 36).

The YCL program and the speeches of the party leaders at the 7th Congress are permeated with the spirit of good-humored complacency with respect to external danger and the

principal source of this danger, as if wars have become impossible or the grounds for them have vanished. And yet, in the Declaration of the Conference of representatives of Communist and worker's parties it is emphatically stressed that: "As long as imperialism exists there will be grounds for aggressive wars." ("Pravda" 22 November 1957).

In his speech at the 7th YCL Congress E. Kardelj put forth the idea that the essence of the principle of coexistence is now different from what Lenin thought of it. Kardelj tried to argue that Lenin put forth this principle as he warned of military danger from the side of imperialism, and that now there is no need of this, since the idea of coexistence is finding increasing favor even in bourgeois circles.

To be sure, there is no need to reexamine the promises of V.I. Lenin with respect to the problem of peaceful coexistence. The Leninist principle of coexistence remains the unshakable foundation of the foreign policy of socialist countries. It has been further developed under modern conditions in the decrees of the 20th and 21st CPSU Congresses. But does this mean that the realization of this principle automatically eliminates the danger of war? Of course not, since the danger of war comes only from the imperialist camp which has not yet made the principle of coexistence the cornerstone of its policy but on the contrary has totally repudiated it. The principle of coexistence is opposed to the policy of war and an enraged struggle is taking place on the world arena between these two trends of foreign policy. This is what is stressed in the declaration: "The problem of war or peaceful coexistence has become the central problem of world policy. The peoples of all the countries must maintain the greatest vigilance with respect to military danger created by imperialism." ("Pravda," 22 November 1957).

The international situation is typified today by the sharply increased struggle between two tendencies: toward peaceful coexistence or war. The first tendency is acquiring an ever greater magnetic force. The change in the relation of forces in favor of the world system of socialism, the brilliant successes of Soviet science and technology, the lessons of the failures and defeats of American imperialism and its policy "from positions of strength" -- all this cannot fail to have a sobering effect even on bourgeois ruling circles, including the US. The scope of anti-war campaigns in England and the FRG Federal Republic of Germany are an evidence of this, as are various utterances in favor of peaceful coexistence by some American figures who recently stood on entirely different positions. The trend toward peaceful coexistence will be victorious. But this is possible under only one condition: the close unity of the socialist camp, the unification

of all the powerful modern forces of peace, the preservation and heightening of national vigilance, the exposure of, and irreconcilable struggle with, the forces of aggression and war which have by no means laid down their arms.

Today, when mankind stands before the cardinal, vital question: war or peace, it is the duty of every Marxist party to take a clear and unequivocal stand between the two opposite forces of world development. The revisionists are trying to evade this question, to occupy the in-between position of a buffer, to maneuver between two camps. Essentially, they equate the imperialist blocs and the Warsaw Pact which unites the socialist countries of Europe for defense purposes. They speak in the same terms of economic aid by the USSR and the US. They even credit both the USSR and the US with the liquidation of the Suez armed conflict, though bourgeois political literature admits the decisive role of the Soviet Union in this matter and the dual and essentially provocative role of the US which revealed itself in full two years later by its armed intervention in Lebanon.

The YCL leaders are embracing the concept of the "third power." In their speeches at the 7th YCL Congress, they stressed that Yugoslavia was and remains "outside of blocs," and E. Kardelj even expounded a whole philosophy of a "third power." He contends that the independent foreign policy of socialist Yugoslavia which remains "outside" military-political pacts is best equipped to strengthen the peace, whereas the giving up of such an independent policy would contribute to the worsening of contradictions in Europe and would do harm to the interests of socialism.

Pretensions to the role of the "third power" are not new in postwar history. It is known that this idea was expounded during the early postwar years by right-wing socialists in a number of West-European countries. This ended in the right-wing socialists' swimming in the stream of the aggressive policy of American imperialism. There is nothing surprising in the fact that American imperialists have always hailed and encouraged (and not only spiritually but materially) all Yugoslav pretensions to the role of the "third power." They surely know well where, into which camp, such pretensions would lead.

The importance of individual correct pronouncements on the problems of international relations in the YCL program and also in the speeches at the 7th Congress is made worthless by the haziness, inconsistency and equivocation of the overall foreign policy of the leaders of the YCL and especially by their direct attempts to revise the cardinal promises of Marxism-Leninism on problems of international relations and foreign policy.

END